REMARKS

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 2:1 2007

I. Preliminary Remarks

The Claims were subject to a Restriction Requirement, mailed March 9, 2006. Applicant chose Group I, Claims 1-11, 20-31 and 76-83, drawn to an immunogenic/vaccine composition, and elected the species of *Leptospira borgpetersenii hardjo-bovis*.

After entry of this paper, Claims 3 and 22 are original. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-11, 20-21, 23, 25-31, 76-77, and 79-82 are amended. Claims 6, 12-19, 24, 26, 32-75, 78, and 83 are withdrawn, with claims 6, 12, 18, 24, 26, 54, 70-72, 78, and 83 being withdrawn and amended. Withdrawn claims are withdrawn without prejudice in an effort to favorably advance prosecution of the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the withdrawn claims in a continuation application, or to have the withdrawn claims rejoined in the current application. Support for the amendments to the claims is found throughout the specification. The amendments do not include new matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are solicited for the reasons set out below.

In this response, Applicant addresses each of the rejections raised by the Examiner. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

This Response is timely filed. The USPTO is given authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 16-1445 for any fees necessary with the submission of this Response.

II. Patentability Arguments

A. The anticipation rejection of Claims 1-2, 7, 20-21, 76, and newly amended claims 8-11, 28-31, and 80-82 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) may properly be withdrawn.

A patent is invalid for anticipation under 35 USC 102(b) if a <u>single</u> prior art reference identically discloses each and every limitation of the invention as set forth in the claims. (Lewmar Marine, Inc. v. Barient, Inc., 827 F.2d 744, 747 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). The prior publication must disclose in an <u>enabling</u> manner the invention that is in question. The exclusion of a claimed element, no matter how insubstantial or obvious, from a reference is enough to negate anticipation. (Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 220 U.S.P.Q. 193, 1098 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). Applicant respectfully submits that these criteria are not met in the Examiner's rejection. The claims, therefore, are not anticipated by the references.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-2, 7, 20-21, 27, 76 and newly amended claims 8-11, 28-31, and 80-82 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bowland, et al., of record (Canadian Veterinary Journal, Jan 2000, Vol. 41, No. 1, pages 33-48). The Examiner has disagreed with our contention in the response to the Office Action of May 1, 2006 that Bowland, et al., do not teach the antigen composition of the present invention comprising two different inactivated BVDV antigens, namely BVDV Type 1 and BVDV Type 2. The Examiner stated that "The commercial vaccine BoviShieldTM3 referenced in Table 1 (page 35) contains BVDV Type 1 and BVDV Type 2. Therefore Bowland does teach the instant claimed invention." We respectfully disagree with the conclusion reached by the Examiner as far as the antigen composition of the commercial vaccine BoviShieldTM3.

As stated above, a rejection of a claim for anticipation requires that the single cited reference disclose each and every element of the claim in an enabling manner. Bowland, et al., do not anticipate the claimed invention because they fail to disclose each and every element of the claim in an enabling manner. Bowland, et al., do not enable an immunogenic composition or a vaccine composition comprising two different strains (Types 1 and 2) of BVD virus. They merely reference BoviShield^{TM3} and indicate that it contains IBRV, PI3 and BVDV. Bowland, et al., do not teach that BoviShieldTM3 contains both BVDV Types 1 and 2. As indicated by the sub-heading within Table 1 of Bowland, et al., (Line 21, Page 35) BoviShieldTM3 is categorized as a 3-Way MLV vaccine, thus containing 3 viral antigens. The Examiner would need to look to another reference to determine whether both Types are included in BoviShieldTM3. However, this is not the standard for an anticipation rejection. Details about the antigenic composition of BoviShield^{TM3} can be found on page 1145 of Compendium of Veterinary Products, Eighth Edition published January 2005 (ISBN 1-889750-81-6 and Library of Congress Card Number: 97-643262 – See attached). According to this description, "BoviShield^{TM3} is a freeze-dried preparation of modified live virus (MLV) strains of IBR, BVD, and PI₃ viruses, plus a sterile diluent used to rehydrate the freeze-dried vaccine." Even this reference does not state whether the preparation contains Type 1, Type 2, or both. Also the viral antigens contained in BoviShield™3 are only IBRV, PI3 and BVDV. It does not contain all of the viral antigens contained in the compositions of

Page 11

the present invention, which include BHV-1, Pl3, BRSV, BVDV-1, and BVDV-2 (see Claims 1, 20, and 76 of the instant invention).

Also indicated by the sub-heading within Table 1 of Bowland, et al., (Line 21, Page 35) BoviShield^{TM3} is categorized as a 3-Way MLV vaccine, The term MLV stands for "Modified Live Virus" as opposed to inactivated virus. While BoviShield^{TM3} is a composition containing a modified live BVD viral antigen, Claims 2, 21, 80, and 82 of the instant invention are drawn to antigen compositions comprising two different inactivated strains (Types 1 and 2) of BVD virus. Thus, Bowland, et al., do not anticipate these claims of the instant invention.

Thus, Bowland, et al., do not teach each and every limitation of Claims 1, 20, or 76 of the instant application. The other rejected claims either depend from one of these independent claims or from a claim that depends from them. These dependent claims further delineate the independent claims; they embody all the elements of them. Accordingly, the subject matter of the dependent claims is not anticipated by Bowland.

Thus, based on the remarks presented herein, the rejection of Claims claims 1-2, 7, 20-21, 27, 76 and newly amended Claims 8-11, 28-31, and 80-82 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

C. The Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-7, 20-27, 76-79 83 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) May Be Properly Withdrawn.

As stated in the MPEP (§2141), to support an obviousness rejection, four basic criteria must be met. These are (A) The claimed invention must be considered as a whole; (B) The references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination; (C) The references must be viewed without the benefit of impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention; and (D) Reasonable expectation of success is the standard with which obviousness is determined. Clearly for prior art to render an invention obvious, it must render obvious the whole invention and not merely some part of the invention (In re Antonie 559 F.2d 618, 620, 195 USPQ 6,8 (CCPA 1997)). The prior art must also be considered as a whole including parts that teach away from Applicant's invention. Applicant respectfully submits that these criteria are not met in the Examiner's rejections.

The Examiner has maintained that Claims 1-7, 20-27, 76-79, 83 and newly amended claims 8-11, 28-31 and 80-82 are unpatentable over Talens, et al., (Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association, May 1, 1989, Vol. 194, No. 9, pages 1273-1280) or Bowland, et al., as originally applied to claims 1-2, 7, 20, 21, 27 and 76, and further in view of Barr, et al., (Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 1998, Vol. 32, No. 3, pages 247-271), Pruett, et al., (Veterinary Parasitology, 1995, Vol. 58, No. 1-2, pages 143-153), and Wilson, et al., (Canadian Journal of Veterinary Research, Oct 1995, Vol. 59, No. 4, pages 299-305). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The compositions of the present invention comprise a group of antigens and a chemically well-defined adjuvant component. The antigens of the present invention are three different modified live viruses, namely Bovine Herpes Virus (BHV), Bovine Respiratory Syncytial virus (BRSV), and parainfluenza virus 3 (PI3) and two different stains of BVD virus. The adjuvant composition is made up of Amphigen, an oil-in-water emulsion, and Quil A, a triterpenoid.

The Examiner stated that Talens, et al., and Bowland, et al., teach the antigen composition of the present invention, and that the adjuvant composition of the present invention can be learned from Barr, et al., Pruett, et al., and Wilson, et al. As explained in our response dated July 14, 2006 to the Office Action dated May 1, 2006, as well as in this present response, neither Talens, et al., nor Bowland, et al., teaches the antigen compositions of the present invention. The antigen composition claimed in the present invention is a mixture of two BVD viral antigens whereas both references cited by the Examiner contain only one strain of BVD viral antigen or do not specify the type of BVD viral antigen. See discussion above.

The Examiner has cited Barr et al., Pruett et al., and Wilson, et al., as prior art references teaching the adjuvant composition of the present invention. According to the examiner, a person skilled in the art could use the teachings about adjuvant compositions in one of these three references and with the teachings of either Talens, et al., or Bowland, et al., reach the vaccine compositions of the present invention. We respectfully disagree with the contention of the examiner.

As established in our response to the Office Action of May 1, 2006, as well as in this response, neither Talens, et al., nor Bowland, et al., teaches the antigen compositions claimed in the present application. Even if we assume that either one of these cited references does teach the antigen composition of the present invention, it can not be concluded that a person skilled in the art could combine their teachings with the teachings about adjuvants in the other three references to reach a vaccine composition of the present invention because neither Barr et al., Pruett et al., nor Wilson, et al., teach nor suggest the adjuvant compositions of the present invention.

The present invention claims an adjuvant composition comprising an oil-in-water emulsion (such as Amphigen) and Quil A (a saponin). Barr, et al., teaches in general about the chemistry and the mode of action of saponin adjuvants. This reference also teaches the preparation and use of immunostimulatory complexes (ISCOM) based on saponin adjuvant. While it teaches the use of Quil A in combination with liposomes, microspheres, and aluminum salts, there is neither a teaching nor a suggestion for combining Quil A with an oilin-water emulsion such as Amphigen.

Pruett, et al., teach a combination of Amphigen and alhydrogel as an adjuvant in a vaccine formulation comprising hypodermin A protein as an antigen. There is no teaching in this reference for combining Quil A with Amphigen. Moreover, this reference focused on showing a synergy in the antibody response due to this Amphigen-Alhydrogel combination. A person skilled in making viral vaccines would have paid attention towards selecting an adjuvant combination based on the synergy in terms of cellular immune response, as the cellular immune response is more important in offering protective immune response due to vaccination. Pruett, et al., suggest the mixture of alhydrogel and amphigen to be worthy of further efficacy investigation in a vaccine formulation only with hypodermin A. There is nothing in Pruett to suggest that the adjuvants used in the cattle grub hypodermin A homogenate vaccine could be used successfully in the compositions of the present invention. Thus a person skilled in the art would not have combined the teachings of Pruett, et al., to prepare a vaccine of present invention.

Wilson, et al., teach the use of a variety of adjuvants in testing the subunit vaccines prepared from extracts of Actinobacillus pleuropnemoniae. Included in the list of adjuvants

tested in this study are Amphigen and Quil A. However, in this reference there was no suggestion to combine Amphigen with Quil A. In one of the animal trials in this study (Trial III, Page 303) Amphigen was used either alone or in combination with vitamin E. As the results shown in the Table III on page 303 indicates, combining Vitamin E with Amphigen significantly reduced the adjuvanticity of Amphigen. With the addition of Vitamin E to Amphigen, the protective immune response, measured in terms of antibody titer, decreased while the mortality rate increased. At the same time addition of Vitamin E to Canola improved the protective immune response. Thus a person skilled in the art, upon seeing the results of Wilson, et al., would be resistant to combine any other adjuvant component with Amphigen in a vaccine formulation.

The MPEP (2143.01) teaches that the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. (Also see In re Fritch (CAFC 1992) 972 F2d 1260, 23 PQ2d 1780 and Monarch Knitting Mach. Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH (CAFC 1989), 139 F3d 877, 45 PQ2d 1977.) However, there is no such suggestion in the references of the desirability of combining the references.

Claims 6, 24, 26, and 78 have been withdrawn, rendering this rejection moot.

The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references cited by the Examiner suggest Applicant's invention. There is no indication in any of the references that would suggest that the references be combined. Moreover, even when combined the references do not yield Applicant's invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the immunogenic compositions and vaccine compositions, as presently claimed, are not rendered obvious by Talens, et al., or Bowland, et al., in view of Barr, et al., Pruett, et al., and Wilson, et al. Thus, based on the remarks presented herein, the rejection of Claims 1-7, 20-27, 76-79, 83 and newly amended claims 8-11, 28-31 and 80-82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Date: March 21, 2007

Patent Appl. No. 10/647,919 Docket No. 15634 (PC25246) Filing Date: August 26, 2003

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER MAR 2 1 2007

III. Conclusion.

In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-5, 7-11, 20-23, 25-31, 76-77, and 79-82 are in condition for allowance and request expedited notification of same.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy J. Gumbleton, Patent Agent

Registration No. 54,143

Pfizer, Inc. Global Intellectual Property 7000 Portage Road Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001 Telephone No. (269) 833-2501 Telefax No. (269) 833-8897



Compendium of Veterinary Products

Eighth Edition

Published January 2005

Publisher Editorial Team

Adrian J. Bayley

Shirley Inglis, RVT Dawn Stahle, BBA Jessle-Lee Schwartz Vanessa Reichert Julie Schmidt Sally Pfeiffer

Penny Shewfelt, AHT

Distributed by

North American Compendiums, Inc. 942 Military Street Port Huron, MI 48060

ISBN 1-889750-81-6

Library of Congress Card Number: 97-843262

Copyright © 2005 All rights reserved

The Compendium of Veterinary Products is produced, printed and published by North American Compendiums, Ltd. for distribution by North American Compendiums, Inc.

None of the contents of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without prior written permission of the publisher.

Prented in US

BOVI-SHEELD™ BRSV

BOVI-PLAZ™

BOUT-PLAZ The
AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

AgriPharm Breish

Bacterin

Breish

Bacterin

Breish

Br

BOVI-SERA SERUM ANTIBODIES

COUNT-SCITA DEPUM ANY I BRUDIES

Antiserum

Actionance Progress-Excharicula COI-Standardin ethermetrica-Pasteurille MozacideSystematic Ryperanters Author(), Service Identification, Berken Origin

U.S. Yet. Lie. No.: 168

Casteste: This product contains the antiquot(s) above.

Contains theme cost and Depond as preservatives.

Initiations: For use at 8th and in the preservation and treatment of empiric and respiratory

conditions caused by the priors organisms conted.

Passeque and Administrativities in being to subcontenuity or intramacrovistry.

Prevention: Calver: 20-40 ril. as soon after both as possible, Cattle: 50-75 ml.

Steep: 10-15 ml.

Sheep: 10-15 mL t: Calves: 40-100 ml., Carde: 75-150 ml., Shaeo: 20-40 ml., Administer et 12-24 hour

intervals until improvement in critical.

Precention in improvement in critical.

Precention in Its Store at 2" to 7"C. Do not freeze. Shake well before use. Use antire contains when third opened.

first operat Certificity: Anaphyticitud reaction may occur tohowing administration of products of tris-nature. It need, administer administer acquivalent. For veterinary use only Wentlag (1): 20 not vetoratis willing 21 days before steepher. Presentation: 20 mil., 250 mil. and 1,000 mil. bodies.

MAC No.: 11010022

BOYI-SHIELDIM 3

Vaccina Plizar Animel Hoshit Bories Relastrachetts-Virus Disabes-Paraktivaszus Vaculos, Madiiksi Livo Vicus

Borber All settachesits "Tirus Disarber-Parahil beactes, Yacuber, Mastimed, Leve Tirus U.S. Vel. Lib. No.: 189
Description: BOM-SHELD" 3 is a freeze-dried preparation of modified the virus (MLV) strains of ISR BYD, and PI viruses, store a sterile dilectin used to rehydrate the freeze-dried vaccioe. Virul artigens are propagated on established coff these Contains generated as preservative. Indications, BOM-SHELD" 3 is for vaccination of healthy, nonpreparant cattle as an eld in preventing infectious borong rhimtracticular casted by infectious bovone rhindrachetts (ISR) with, bowner and identified Sport and Type 2) caused by boriter viral distribute (SVD) virus, and distance caused by parainthorates (Pb) virus.

disease Caused by barainfluenzis (Ply) white.

Directions:

1. Giveral Directions: Vaccination of healthy, nongregulant cattle is recommended. Associating relayable to the traces defined vaccine with the stores direct provided. Stable with an experience of the first provided. Stable with a reasonable relation of the rest.

2. Privately Vaccination: Annual repeatable of the expectator region of the rect.

2. Privately Vaccination: Annual repeatable of the expectator region of the rect.

3. Respectively. States at 27-70. Protological exposure to higher temperatures and/or direct survival may advarsally affect pottage, to not freeze.

Use refers compress when their operand. Sandifferd syninges and needless should be sense to advantage the vaccine. Do not sterile desired and any standards and restricted and sandards and restricted and sandards.

Sandifferd syninges and needless should be used to administration. Do not sterile with chemicals because traces of distinction may insurtivate fire vaccine. Do not sterile with chemicals because traces of distinction may insurtivate fire vaccine.

Sandifferd syninges and needless should be used to administration of the calves nursing pregnant calves.

Castlengies to not use on pregnant cover subcritions can restult or an calves nursing pregnant calves.

As with meany vaccines. Lampbridged may never after sould or an calves nursing pregnant

calves.

As with many veccines, anaphylads may occur after use, leichal antidate of ephiephrine is recommended and should be followed with appropriate supportive therapy.

This product has been shown to be efficiently in healthy entirest. A protective immune response may not be evicted if artimate are neobating an infectious observe, are realisaurished or parasithed, are selected due to still primate or environmental conditions, are followed as immuniconopromised, or the accurate is not arministance accordance with label directions:

Warning(s): Do not vaccinate within 21 days before staughter.
For exterious bas only

When fingle 10 and exact he within 21 days before staughter.

For relativity but only

Discreption: Discrete Descriptors IBR, BVD, and Pb, viruses are commonly associated with
resolvatory designs entire reproductive failure in cattle. IBR virus embellion is characterized by
resolvatory designs entire reproductive failure in cattle. IBR virus embellion is characterized by
right-inverses of respectation, coupling, loss of apprilts, and dependent control

find nose?), increased rate of respectation, coupling, loss of apprilts, and dependent control

entrol design programmy entry short.

BVD virus may be trusterified in reast socretions, salive, brook, tests, and/or enne, and by
direct contact with control during programmy may result in abortion, testal resolvation, or congenital
restormation of the fetus. Moreover, it susceptible covers are related with never propriets BVD-mancreal disease Climate in virus. Exposure of thruse calves to certain virused reporting to BVD virus during the interest or programmy their calves may be been persistently infected with
the rounds, prototer sulfativity, delevated temporative, disminus, adoptive does of appetite, utterations in
the mouth, prototer sulfativity, delevated temporative, disminus, adoptive does not allevance.

Ps, virus usuary locatives in the upper recollatory tract causing devided temporative and
moderate septil and occurs discharge. Although climated signs typically are mild request.

weakers respiratory bessess. Invasion and replication of other publicaries, particularly Passionals upp., to trained laboration and may result in presentous. This Data: Spaidy and Efficiently is cately studies of the instance of EON-SHIELD 1, no coverage section to instanciated with observed. Efficacy of each traction of BON-SHIELD 2 was demonstrated in challenge of immunity tradict. Cately excellently than the traction, showed no sent or had significantly leved of immunity tradict. Cately excellent of that instance, showed no sent or had significantly leved of infrast signs man nonexcellented cately of the Services showed on romaterial on brains moneycolist interferonce among the theclaims of BON-SHIELD 2.

PRESENTIFIE: 10 doje and 50 dose Vals.

75-4144-01

BOVI-SHIELDYN 4

BOVI-SHIELD™ 4

Pitter Animal Hearth
Borto Rhields the Unit Hos Olambes-Persintences, Respiratory Systyties (Nature 1984) that Olambes-Persintences, Respiratory Systyties (Nature 1984) that I have been also been selected the Unit of Hos Olambes Persintences, Respiratory Systyties (Nature 1984) that I have been selected the Unit of IRR 800 Pb. 2 and 880 V wasses, piles a stende obsert used to rehydrate the Instruction Solvi-Shield. What intigons are propagated of established call here.
Contributing quanterious as preparative.
Indicates: SOVI-S-GRILD™ 4 is for succination of health, ecopyregical cable as an all preventing intertumes to Provide the Unit of Solvi-Shields. Solvies of the Instructions bowker minortaneous (SOVI) white, bowker that (Idrihyer's and Type 2) caused by beeine was distributed (SVI) white, and disease caused by paraintheoracy; (Ps) were and bowker respiratory groups's some (BXV).
Diseatle see:

1. Convert (Prestocribe Veccession of healthy, engang van cathle is recommended. As spécially rehydrate the frequencies of the massacian required products about do administrate shipe 1 and ducto to healthy caths, informed by a second case of Bowl-Shield™ SRSV 3-4 weeks take:

2. Primary Vaccinations Animal revocaseabow with a single dose is recommended.

4. Bood animal hastandry and hard seath measurement practices should be employed. Presentiously Story at 2-7-10. Professed on expression to higher temperatures and/br direct surright may obversely affect primary. Do not frietze.

Literative condents when first opened.

Storilluid syrings and needles shourt be used to administer this vaccine. Do not story represent casts, shortware can result of in cases stars on preparations.

Been containers and all unused contains.

Castleagly: Do not use as in represent cases altorotors can result of in cases stars on programatic contains.

Barn considers and all unstact contains.

Certified;) Do not serie in pregnest closes (abortions can result) or in cases duris on pregnest closes (abortions can result) or in cases duris on pregnest closes (abortions can result) or in cases duris on pregnest closes (abortions can result) or in cases duris on pregnest closes (abortions can result) or in cases duris on appreciation of the cases of the content of the cases of the cas

BOYLSHIELD™ BRSV

PUTER A PRINCIP BROV

PUTER A PRINCIP MEMBER

Bodies Respiratory Symptol Virus Ventine, Medified Live Virus

U.S. Vel. Lic. No. 187

U.S. Vel. Lic. No. 187

Description: BDN-SHELD** SRSV is a bran-oried preparation of an attenualist strain of BRSV propagated on an attankined bodies cell line, plus a stanke discert used to rehydrate the freeze-dred section.

es gentamica es presenctive.

© CVP CD-ROM and Web access information is inside the Front Cover of the CVP.

1145